

REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, the examiner finally rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradley et al. Applicants request reconsideration of their application in view of this response which refutes the examiner's response to Applicants' Paper No. 3.

In the Detailed Action, the examiner made only two statements relative to Applicants' Paper No. 3.

First, the examiner noted that amended Claim 1 recites "a mirrored shaft that is linearly displaceable along an axis of the shaft for presenting different views to said imaging device". This is true, but amended Claim 1 also recites "drive means for producing linear displacement of said mirrored shaft along said axis to change the view presented to said imaging device". Applicants' remarks in Paper No. 3 stress these recitations as distinguishing over Bradley et al. In other words, Bradley et al. show a shaft that is rotatable, and drive means for rotating the shaft, whereas Applicants have claimed a shaft is linearly displaceable, and drive means for producing linear displacement of the shaft to change views presented to the imaging device.

And second, the examiner stated that "applicant admits that the prior art teaches the mirror on a shaft that is rotational *and therefore it is displaceable in a linear direction*". This statement is nonsensical. Applicants stated, and still state, that linear motion is not equivalent to, or even suggestive of, rotational motion. One does not imply the other, and it is ridiculous to say that a shaft is displaceable in a linear direction because it is rotational. An analogous statement would be that the shaft is green, and therefore it is orange. Consequently, the rejection is founded on erroneous and unsupportable reasoning.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-5 be withdrawn because the examiner failed to give the claim recitations their normal meanings, and instead equated two terms (linear movement and rotational movement) that in fact have very different meanings. Claims 2-5 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and are patentable over Bradley et al. at least by virtue of such dependency.

U. S. Serial No. 10/652,987 -- 3

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance and request that such claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Navarre, Attorney  
Registration No. 29572  
Telephone: (937) 653-3501